#### **AMENDMENT**

## IN THE CLAIMS:

Please cancel claims 2-4 and 12-55 without prejudice to filing one or more divisional applications.

#### **REMARKS**

## I. Rationale for the Amendment of the claims

Claims 2-4 and 12-55 have been cancelled solely in response to the Examiner's restriction requirement. Applicant notes that if claim 1 is determined to be patentable, claims 2-55 will all be entitled to consideration.

# II. Election/Restriction requirement

### A. Groups designated by Examiner

The Examiner has alleged that the currently pending claims contain the following groups of inventions:

- I. Claims 1-4, drawn to a table saw with a rail configuration.
- II. Claims 1, 5-11, drawn to a table saw with a locking mechanism.
- III. Claims 1, 12-13, drawn to a table saw with a table configuration.
- IV. Claims 1, 14, 15, 36-40, drawn to a table saw with a rip fence.
- V. Claims 1, 16-22, 41-44, drawn to a table saw with a rip fence scale.
- VI. Claims 1, 24-25, 45-46, drawn to a table saw with a blade guard.
- VII. Claims 1, 26-32, 47-50, drawn to a table saw with a cradle and elevation mechanism.
- VIII. Claims 1, 26, 27, 33-35, 51-55, drawn to a table saw with a bevel mechanism.

## B. Response to Examiner's requirement

Applicant believes that, contrary to the Primary Examiner's requirement, that at least the restriction of claims 12 and 13 is improper. The Primary Examiner has indicated in the Office Action that Group I does not require the first table configuration of group III, and group III does not require the details of the rail configuration of group I. The Applicant notes that claims 12 and 13 are dependent on claim 1, which does require the rail details of that claim. Further, the Applicant notes that a single table saw search will also reveal whether or not handles and miter gauge grooves are found on table saws with no additional searching.

In any event, Applicant provisionally elects, with traverse, to prosecute claims 1 and 5-11, *i.e.*, the Group II claims, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.143.

### III. Conclusions

In view of the above remarks, Applicant holds that at least the first distinction between groups I and III is improper. The Examiner is invited to contact Mark Gleason at (952) 474-3701 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

D. Delos Larson

Reg. No. 46,118

Agent for Applicant

HOWREY SIMON ARNOLD & WHITE, LLP 750 Bering Drive Houston, Texas 77057-2198 (713) 787-1438

Date:

<u> 12/61</u>